



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/593,060	06/13/2000	Tatsuya Eguchi	52178-020	5731

20277 7590 11/29/2002
MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY
600 13TH STREET, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3096

EXAMINER

LOWE, TREFFANEY R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2697

DATE MAILED: 11/29/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/593,060

Applicant(s)

EGUCHI ET AL.

Examiner

TREFFANEY R LOWE

Art Unit

2697

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 13 June 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☒ Other: 1472.

Art Unit: 2697

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because lines 1, 5, 7, and 12 has phrase "means". Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 6, 8-9 and 17 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Flores et al (US Patent 6,370,498), hereinafter referenced as Flores.

Art Unit: 2697

Regarding **claim 6**, a translating apparatus, comprising: translating means for translating document data into another language (Fig. 4);
an output unit for outputting the translated document data translated by said translating means (Fig 5A);
a mode setting unit for setting the translating apparatus in a prescribed mode (Fig. 5A, col. 6: 48-50);
and a controller (Fig 5A, col. 6: 48-50);

wherein, in a case where the prescribed mode is set, said controller controls said translating means so as to translate the document data including a plurality of languages into at least one language, and controls said output unit so as to output the translated document data (col. 2: 11-16).

Regarding **claim 8**, the translating apparatus as recited in claim 6, wherein said output unit includes a display for displaying the translated document data (col. 4: 35-36).

Regarding **claim 9**, the translating apparatus as recited in claim 6, further comprising an operation unit for specifying a plurality of original languages and at least one language to be translated (col. 6: 50-54).

Regarding **claim 17**, Flores discloses an apparatus and method for multilingual user access. In addition, Flores discloses a translating apparatus, comprising: translating means for translating document data into another language (Fig. 4);

an output unit for outputting the translated document data translated by said translating means(Fig. 5A);

a controller (Abstract, where “the user may choose to have a document displayed textually in two separate languages”).

wherein said controller controls said translating means so as to translate each of the first document data and the second document data into a first language and a second language (col. 5: 27-49). wherein said controller controls said translating means so as to translate a first document data written in a first language and a second document data written in a second language into at least one language (col. 5: 27-49), and controls said output unit so as to output the translated first and second document data (col. 2: 61-65, Fig. 5A)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5, 7, 10-16 and 18 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Flores in view of Fujisawa et al (US Patent 5,729,618) hereinafter reference to as Fujisawa and in further view of Miyahara et al (US Patent 6,314,213) hereinafter referenced to as Miyahara.

Regarding **claim 1**, Flores discloses an apparatus and method for multilingual user access. In addition, Flores discloses a translating apparatus, comprising: translating means for translating document data into another language (Fig 4);

an output unit for outputting the translated document data translated by said translating means(Fig. 5A);

a mode setting unit for setting the translating apparatus in a first mode or a second mode (Abstract/ "A user can create and retrieve multiple translations of a work and may choose to have the multiple texts and/or translations presented in different formats");

and a controller (Abstract);

wherein, in a case where the first mode is set, said controller controls said translating means so as to translate the document data into a plurality of languages, and wherein, in a case where the second mode is set, said controller controls said translating means so as to translate the document data into a plurality of languages (Fig. 4).

Flores fails to teach an apparatus comprising a mode setting for controlling the output unit so as to controls said output unit so as to output the translated document data by same language group and controls said output unit so as to output the translated document data by group including each translated language document data. Fujisawa discloses a photocopy machine translating a printed document from one language to another language (col. 1 lines 25-35) but fail to explicitly teach outputting the translated document by same language group or

Art Unit: 2697

group including each translated language document. Miyahara discloses an image processing apparatus and method which process image on the basis of direction of document. Miyahara teaches the sorting and/or grouping of the output documents (Fig 2, #22). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify Flores's method to include Fujisawa's method of outputting and to further include Miyahara's method for sorting and/or grouping, for the purpose of providing an organized method for the translated document.

Regarding **claim 2**, Flores, Fujisawa and Miyahara all the limitations of **claim 1**, in addition Fujisawa discloses a translating apparatus as recited in claim 1, wherein said output unit includes a printing device for printing the translated document data on a sheet. (col. 1: 25-35).

Regarding **claim 3**, Flores, Fujisawa and Miyahara all the limitations of **claim 2**. In a similar field of endeavor, Miyahara discloses a printer. In addition, Miyahara provides adequate support for a sorter for sorting printed sheets by the group (Fig. 2, #22).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to modify Flores and Fujisawa with Miyahara to get the copier with capabilities of sorting into groups and to further modify that with Flores to get the translating device to sort into groups.

Regarding **claim 4**, Flores, Fujisawa and Miyahara all the limitations of **claim 1**. Flores further discloses the translating apparatus as recited in claim 1, wherein said output unit includes a display for displaying the translated document data (Flores, col. 4: 35-36).

Regarding **claim 5**, Flores, Fujisawa and Miyahara all the limitations of **claim 1**. Flores further discloses the translating apparatus as recited in claim 1, further comprising an operation unit for specifying an original language and a plurality of languages to be translated (Flores, col. 6 :42-54).

Regarding **claim 7**, Flores, Fujisawa and Miyahara all the limitations of **claim 6**. In the same field of endeavor, Fujisawa discloses a copier capable of automatically translating documents printed in a foreign language before outputting it, which reads on output unit that includes a printing device for printing the translated document data on a sheet (col. 1: 25-35)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the translating apparatus of Flores with the copier or automatically translating documents with Fujisawa to get the printing device connected to the translating device.

Regarding **claim 10**, Flores, Fujisawa and Miyahara all the limitations of **claim 9**. Flores teach wherein, in a case where a plurality of language to be translated are specified by said operation unit (col. 6: 50-54), said controller controls said translating means so as to translate each original language into the plurality of languages to be translated (Fig. 4). However Flores fails to specifically disclose controls said output unit so as to output the plurality of translated languages. The concept of using a translating apparatus as defined by Flores combined with an output is well known in the art, as taught by Fujisawa.

In the same field of endeavor, Fujisawa discloses a copier with an automatic translating function capable of translating a document in a foreign language before outputting it (col. 1: 25-35). However, Fujisawa does not teach grouping the translated documents in the same translated language. It is well known in the art, as taught by Miyahara, that a copier that can print can be designed to have a sorter for grouping.

In the same field of endeavor, Miyahara discloses a copier with a sorter for grouping (Fig. 2, #22). Therefore it would have been obvious to modify Fujisawa's translating copier with Miyahara's copier to get a copier that would group documents together. Furthermore, it would

Art Unit: 2697

have been obvious to modify Flores translating apparatus with Fujisawa's copier with automatic translations capabilities to get a translating apparatus that a plurality of languages may be translated and then outputted.

Regarding **claim 11**, Flores discloses an apparatus and method for multilingual user access. In addition, Flores discloses a translating apparatus, comprising: translating means for translating a first document data and a second document data into another language (col. 1: 61-65);

an output unit for outputting the translated document data translated by said translating means(Fig. 5A);

a controller (Abstract).

wherein said controller controls said translating means so as to translate each of the first document data and the second document data into a first language and a second language (col. 6: 26-38). Flores fails to teach an apparatus where it controls said output unit so as to output the first and second document data translated into the first language as a first group and the first and second document data translated into the second language as a second group. It is well known in the art, as taught by Fujisawa, to combine an apparatus for outputting the information translated using the translating apparatus means used by Flores.

Fujisawa discloses a photocopy machine translating a printed document from one language to another language (col. 1 lines 25-35) but fail to explicitly teach outputting the translated document so as to output the first and second document data translated into the first language as a first group and the first and second document data translated into the second language as a second group. Miyahara discloses an image processing apparatus and method

Art Unit: 2697

which process image on the basis of direction of document. Miyahara teaches the sorting and/or grouping of the output documents (Fig 2, #22). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify Flores's method to include Fujisawa's method of outputting and to further include Miyahara's method for sorting and/or grouping, for the purpose of providing an organized method for the translated document.

Regarding **claim 12**, Flores, Fujisawa and Miyahara all the limitations of **claim 11**, in addition Fujisawa discloses a translating apparatus as recited in claim 11, wherein said output unit includes a printing device for printing the translated document data on a sheet. (col. 1: 25-35).

Regarding **claim 13**, Flores, Fujisawa and Miyahara all the limitations of **claim 11**. Flores further discloses the translating apparatus as recited in claim 11, wherein said output unit includes a display for displaying the translated document data (Flores, col. 4: 35-36).

Regarding **claim 14**, Flores discloses an apparatus and method for multilingual user access. In addition, Flores discloses a translating apparatus, comprising: translating means for translating document data into another language (Fig. 4);

an output unit for outputting the translated document data translated by said translating means(Fig. 5A, col. 6: 48-50);

a controller (Abstract, "the uswer may choose to have a document displayed textually in tow separate languages").

wherein said controller controls said translating means so as to translate each of the first document data and the second document data into a first language and a second language (col. 6: 26-38). Flores fails to teach an apparatus where it controls said output unit so as to repeatedly

Art Unit: 2697

output the document data translated into the first and second languages as a single group by the number to be output set by said operation unit. It is well known in the art, as taught by Fujisawa, to combine an apparatus for outputting the information translated using the translating apparatus means used by Flores.

Fujisawa discloses a photocopy machine translating a printed document from one language to another language where it controls said output unit so as to repeatedly output the document data translated into the first and second languages (col. 1 lines 25-35) but fail to explicitly teach outputting the translated document into the first and second languages as a single group by the number to be output set by said operation unit. Miyahara discloses an image processing apparatus and method which process image on the basis of direction of document. Miyahara teaches the sorting and/or grouping of the output documents (Fig 3). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify Flores's method to include Fujisawa's method of outputting and to further include Miyahara's method for sorting and/or grouping, for the purpose of providing an organized method for the translated document.

Regarding **claim 15**, Flores, Fujisawa and Miyahara all the limitations of **claim 14**, in addition Fujisawa discloses a translating apparatus as recited in claim 14, wherein said output unit includes a printing device for printing the translated document data on a sheet. (col. 1: 25-35).

Regarding **claim 16**, Flores, Fujisawa and Miyahara all the limitations of **claim 14**. Flores further discloses the translating apparatus as recited in claim 14, wherein said output unit includes a display for displaying the translated document data (Flores, col. 4: 35-36).

Art Unit: 2697

Regarding **claim 18**, Flores, Fujisawa and Miyahara all the limitations of **claim 17**.

Flores discloses a translating apparatus as recited in claim 17, further comprising an operation unit for specifying a translated language, wherein, in a case where a third language and a fourth language are specified as a language to be translated said controller controls said translating means so as to translate each of the first document data and the second document data into the third language and the fourth language (col. 6: 26-38). Flores fails to teach an apparatus that control said output unit so as to output the first and second document data translated into the third language as a group and the first and second document data translated into the fourth language as a group. It is well known in the art, as taught by Fujisawa, to combine an apparatus for outputting the information translated.

Fujisawa discloses a photocopy machine translating a printed document from one language to another language (col. 1 lines 25-35) but fail to explicitly teach outputting the translated document so as to output unit so as to output the first and second document data translated into the third language as a group and the first and second document data translated into the fourth language as a group. Miyahara discloses an image processing apparatus and method which process image on the basis of direction of document. Miyahara teaches the sorting and/or grouping of the output documents (Fig 2, #22). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify Flores's method to include Fujisawa's method of outputting and to further include Miyahara's method for sorting and/or grouping, for the purpose of providing an organized method for the translated document.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TREFFANEY R LOWE whose telephone number is 703-305-5593. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 7:30-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, JEFFERY HOFFSASS can be reached on 703-305-4717. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-9430 for regular communications and 703-746-9430 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-.

trl

November 18, 2002


Richmond Dorvil
Primary Examiner